arXiv:1302.2294v1 [math.CV] 10 Feb 2013

ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN D'ANGELO q-TYPE AND CATLIN q-TYPE

VASILE BRINZANESCU AND ANDREEA C. NICOARA

Abstract. The two standard ways of measuring the order of contact of q-dimensional complex varieties with the boundary of a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$, the D'Angelo q-type and the Catlin q-type, were known to be equal for $q = 1$. In this work, we show the D'Angelo q-type dominates the Catlin q-type from above for any $1 \leq q < n$. In the other direction, provided the D'Angelo q-type is finite and the domain has the q version of D'Angelo's property P, a power of the Catlin q-type dominates the D'Angelo q-type from above modulo a constant. In particular, these two notions are simultaneously finite and effectively related for a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. D'Angelo q-type and property P 3
3. Catlin q-type 10
4. Proof of the Main Theorem 12
References 13

1. Introduction

The quest for the best measure of the order of contact of complex varieties with the boundary of a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ originates from the study of the subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem. Joseph J. Kohn proved in 1979 in [15] that for a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with real-analytic boundary the subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem for (p, q) forms is equivalent to the property that all holomorphic varieties of complex dimension q have finite order of contact with the boundary of the domain. Soon afterwards, John D'Angelo introduced a quantitative measure for this order of contact, presently known as the D'Angelo q-type, Δ_q. In a series of papers, D'Angelo fleshed out its more important properties culminating with openness and finite determination, which he established in 1982 in [10]. Meanwhile, David Catlin was working on extending Kohn's result to smooth pseudoconvex domains, which he carried out in a series of very deep papers [2], [3], and [4]. The notion of finite order of contact of holomorphic varieties of complex dimension q with the boundary of the domain that he defined in [4] and showed is equivalent to the subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem for (p, q) forms for smooth

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32F18; 32T25; Secondary 32V35.

Key words and phrases. D'Angelo finite q-type, Catlin finite q-type, finite type domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

pseudoconvex domains is not the same as D'Angelo's notion. The two trivially agree for $q = 1$, i.e. for holomorphic curves, but for $q > 1$ David Catlin merely expressed the hope that they might be shown to equal each other. Catlin's notion is what became known as Catlin q-type, D_q. Much later in 1999, in a joint survey paper by John D'Angelo and Joseph J. Kohn [13], it was claimed that these two notions ought to be simultaneously finite.

Catlin's result in [4] went further than just establishing the equivalence in the sense that he also proved a lower bound for subelliptic gain in the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem

$$\epsilon \geq \tau^{-n^2 \tau^{n^2}}$$

that holds for any smooth pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and is exponential in $\tau = D_q$, his notion of contact of holomorphic varieties of complex dimension q with the boundary of the domain. Apart from Catlin's result, there are a number of either sharp or effective bounds for subelliptic gain for $(0, 1)$ forms, i.e. when $q = 1$, in terms of $\Delta_1 = D_1$; see [16], [6], [14], and [7]. Any other such result for $q > 1$ obtained in terms of D'Angelo's more standardly used notion of q-type would have to be compared against Catlin's benchmark estimate. Herein lies the significance of our work in this paper as we relate Δ_q with D_q for $q > 1$, thus enabling such a comparison.

Our main result is the following:

Main Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω in $\mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain with C^∞ boundary. Let $x_0 \in b\Omega$ be a point on the boundary of the domain, and let $1 \leq q < n$. The D'Angelo q-type at x_0 $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ dominates the Catlin q-type $D_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ from above, i.e. $D_q(b\Omega, x_0) \leq \Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$. If $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) < \infty$ and the domain has the q version of D'Angelo's property P at x_0, then $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) \leq 2\left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q}$. In particular, if $b\Omega$ is pseudoconvex at x_0 and $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) < \infty$, then $D_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ and $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ are simultaneously finite and effectively related via*

$$D_q(b\Omega, x_0) \leq \Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) \leq 2\left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q}.$$

By definition, $D_q(b\Omega, x_0) \geq 2$, and

$$2\left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q} = D_q(b\Omega, x_0)\ \left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q-1},$$

so the upper bound for $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ given here is not sharp for $q = 1$, when $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ and $D_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ are equal to each other. We exclude the value $q = n$ because $b\Omega$ has real dimension $2n - 1$, so looking at its order of contact with an n dimensional complex variety does not make sense. It is also known that subellipticity with exponent $\epsilon = 1$ holds at all boundary points for (p, n) forms. The reader may consult p.83 of [15]. The last part of Theorem 1.1 follows because a pseudoconvex domain where $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) < \infty$ satisfies the q version of D'Angelo's property P at x_0, a generalization of D'Angelo's property P for $q > 1$. It should be noted here that D'Angelo's property P defined in [10] is not the same as Catlin's Property (P) introduced by Catlin in [5]. D'Angelo's notion is a local notion that pertains to hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^n$ where $\Delta_1(b\Omega, x_0) < \infty$, is weaker than pseudoconvexity, and implies some estimates among certain notions of type. By contrast, Catlin's Property (P) is a global notion that entails the existence of a smooth plurisubharmonic function on the closure of the domain with certain properties, is more general than the D'Angelo 1-type being finite at each boundary point, and has the compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator as a consequence. Details can be found in [5] and [1].

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 defines D'Angelo q-type and outlines a number of its properties. D'Angelo's property P is also defined here along with its q version for $q > 1$. Section 3 is devoted to the Catlin q-type. The two notions are then related in Section 4, where the Main Theorem 1.1 is also proven.

Acknowledgements The authors wish to thank David Catlin and John D'Angelo for a number of very useful discussions. The first author was partially supported by the grant PN-II-ID-PCE-2012-4-0156. He would like to thank the Department of Mathematics at the University of Pennsylvania for the hospitality during the preparation of part of this article.

2. D'Angelo q-type and property P

Starting with [8], John D'Angelo introduced various numerical functions that measure the maximum order of contact of holomorphic varieties of complex dimension q with a real hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^n$ such as the boundary of a domain. The interested reader should consult [12] for the most comprehensive treatment of this topic.

We shall first give the classical definition of order of contact for $q = 1$, holomorphic curves, where the most natural definition is clear. We shall then see how much more complicated this order of contact is to define for $q > 1$. Let r be a defining function for the real hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(m, p)$ be the set of all germs of holomorphic curves

$$\varphi : (U, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}^m, p),$$

where U is some neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{C}^1$ and $\varphi(0) = p$. For all $t \in U$, $\varphi(t) = (\varphi_1(t), \ldots, \varphi_m(t))$, where $\varphi_j(t)$ is holomorphic for every j with $1 \leq j \leq m$. For each component φ_j, the order of vanishing at the origin $ord_0\, \varphi_j$ is the order of the first non-vanishing derivative of φ_j, i.e. $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi_j(0) = \cdots = \frac{d^{s-1}}{dt^{s-1}}\varphi_j(0) = 0,$$

but $\frac{d^s}{dt^s}\varphi_j(0) \neq 0$. We set $ord_0\, \varphi = \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} ord_0\, \varphi_j$. Consider $\varphi^* r$, the pullback of r to φ, and let $ord_0\, \varphi^* r$ be the order of the first non-vanishing derivative at the origin of $\varphi^* r$ viewed as a function of t.

Definition 2.1. *Let M be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let r be a defining function for M. The D'Angelo 1-type at $x_0 \in M$ is given by*

$$\Delta_1(M, x_0) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(n, x_0)} \frac{ord_0\, \varphi^* r}{ord_0\, \varphi}.$$

If $\Delta_1(M, x_0)$ is finite, we call x_0 a point of finite D'Angelo 1-type.

Remark: John D'Angelo showed $\Delta_1(M, x_0)$ is well-defined, i.e. independent of the defining function r chosen for M. He also showed it fails to be upper semi-continuous in [9]. Fortunately, $\Delta_1(M, x_0)$ being finite is an open condition, and $\Delta_1(M, x_0)$ itself is finitely determined, i.e. it is determined merely by a certain jet of the Taylor expansion of r at x_0 and not the entire Taylor expansion. We shall rigorously state both of these properties after we define $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$.

When holomorphic varieties have complex dimension greater than 1, there is no longer just one natural definition of their order of contact with a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$ as not every holomorphic variety of dimension $q \geq 2$ has a local parametrization. One approach is to reduce this case to computing $\Delta_1(\tilde{M}, x_0)$ for a related hypersurface $\tilde{M}$ sitting in a different $\mathbb{C}^m$ such that the holomorphic varieties of dimension q generically become holomorphic curves in the new ambient space. This is the approach taken by D'Angelo in [10]. Let $\phi : \mathbb{C}^{n-q+1} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be any linear embedding of $\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}$ into $\mathbb{C}^n$. For generic choices of ϕ, the pullback $\phi^* M$ will be a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}$. We can thus define $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ as follows:

Definition 2.2. *Let M be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let r be a defining function for M. The D'Angelo q-type at $x_0 \in M$ is given by*

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \inf_{\phi} \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(n-q+1, x_0)} \frac{ord_0\, \varphi^* \phi^* r}{ord_0\, \varphi} = \inf_{\phi} \Delta_1(\phi^* r, x_0),$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{C}^{n-q+1} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ is any linear embedding of $\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}$ into $\mathbb{C}^n$ and we have identified x_0 with $\phi^{-1}(x_0)$. If $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ is finite, we call x_0 a point of finite D'Angelo q-type.

By truncating the Taylor expansion of the defining function r at x_0, John D'Angelo was able to prove one of the most important properties of $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$, namely the openness of the set of points of finite q-type. Furthermore, using ideas from algebraic geometry over the ring of holomorphic functions, John D'Angelo was able to give a bound on the maximal jump of $\Delta_q(M, x)$ in a neighborhood of x_0. We recall Theorem 6.2 from p.634 of [10]:

Theorem 2.3. *Let M be a smooth real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ be finite at some $x_0 \in M$, then there exists a neighborhood V of x_0 on which*

$$\Delta_q(M, x) \leq 2(\Delta_q(M, x_0))^{n-q}.$$

Remark: This theorem holds **independently** of pseudoconvexity.

We shall now state another essential property of $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$, being finite determined. This is Proposition 14 from p.88 of [11]:

Theorem 2.4. *The function $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ is finite determined. In other words, if $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ is finite, then there exists an integer k such that $\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \Delta_q(M', x_0)$ for M' a hypersurface defined by any r' that has the same k-jet at x_0 as the defining function r of M.*

Remark: Let $t = \Delta_q(M, x_0) < \infty$, then it follows from the proof of Proposition 14 in [11] that we can let $k = \lceil t \rceil$, the roundup of t, i.e. the lowest integer greater than or equal to t.

For the purpose of relating $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ with $D_q(b\Omega, x_0)$, we will need to show that $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ is generic with respect to the choices of linear embeddings $\phi : \mathbb{C}^{n-q+1} \to \mathbb{C}^n$. In fact, to each linear embedding $\phi : \mathbb{C}^{n-q+1} \to \mathbb{C}^n$, there corresponds a set of $q-1$ linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, the local ring of holomorphic germs in n variables at $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. The zero set of $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ is locally the image of ϕ. Obviously, there is a one-to-one correspondence between linear embeddings from $\mathbb{C}^{n-q+1}$ into $\mathbb{C}^n$ and non-degenerate such sets of linear forms.

Restating the embedding ϕ as a non-degenerate set of linear forms points to the necessity of having a notion of type that applies to an ideal rather than just a hypersurface, which is what has been defined so far. Indeed, D'Angelo makes the following definition on p.86 of [11]:

Definition 2.5. *Let $C^\infty_{x_0}$ be the ring of smooth germs at $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ideal in $C^\infty_{x_0}$.*

$$\Delta_1(\mathcal{I}, x_0) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(n, x_0)} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{ord_0\, \varphi^* g}{ord_0\, \varphi}.$$

Remark: If M be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $x_0 \in M$, let $\mathcal{I}(M)$ be the ideal of smooth germs in $C^\infty_{x_0}$ that vanish on the germ of M at x_0. Then $\Delta_1(\mathcal{I}(M), x_0) = \Delta_1(M, x_0)$ because the infimum in Definition 2.5 is realized by a defining function of M, which has order 1 at x_0. Of course, it has already been mentioned that $\Delta_1(M, x_0)$ is well-defined, i.e. independent of the choice of defining function.

Now we can give an equivalent definition to Definition 2.2 that was first stated by D'Angelo on the bottom of p.86 of [11]:

Definition 2.6. *Let M be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let $x_0 \in M$. If $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ is any non-degenerate set of linear forms in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, the D'Angelo q-type at $x_0 \in M$ is given by*

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \inf_{\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}} \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big)$$

where $(\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1})$ is the ideal in $C^\infty_{x_0}$ generated by $\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}$.

Since working in the ring $C^\infty_{x_0}$ is not particularly easy, it would be helpful to reduce the computation of type to a computation in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, which has much better algebraic properties. Let us assume for the moment that $\Delta_q(M, x_0) = t < \infty$, and let $k = \lceil t \rceil$, the roundup of t. By Theorem 2.4 and the remark following it, $\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \Delta_q(M_k, x_0)$, where M_k is real hypersurface defined by r_k, the polynomial that has the same k-jet at x_0 as the defining function r of M. The advantage of working with r_k is that we can apply polarization to it, namely we can give a holomorphic decomposition for r_k as

$$r_k = Re\{h\} + ||f||^2 - ||g||^2,$$

where $||f||^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N |f_j|^2$, $||g||^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N |g_j|^2$, and the functions $h, f_1, \dots, f_N, g_1, \dots, g_N$ are all holomorphic polynomials in n variables. This idea first appeared in Section III of D'Angelo's paper [10]. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{U}(N)$ is the group of $N \times N$ unitary matrices, then for every such unitary matrix $U \in \mathcal{U}(N)$, we can consider the ideal of holomorphic polynomials $\mathcal{I}(U, x_0) = (h, f - Ug)$ generated by h and the N components of $f - Ug$, where $f = (f_1, \dots, f_N)$ and $g = (g_1, \dots, g_N)$. It turns out that

$$\sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \Delta_1(\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), x_0) \leq \Delta_1(M_k, x_0) \leq 2 \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \Delta_1(\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), x_0). \tag{2.1}$$

We have used Corollary 3.7 on p.627 of [10]. If we now combine this result with Definition 2.6 and Theorem 2.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) \leq \Delta_q(M, x_0) \\ &\leq 2 \inf_{\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Since $\mathcal{U}(N)$ is compact, the supremum over it would be easy to handle if Δ_1 were an upper semi-continuous quantity, but it is not as shown by D'Angelo in [9]. We thus need to compare Δ_1 to some other quantity computed in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ that is upper semi-continuous. We will use

$$D(\mathcal{I}, x_0) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{O}_{x_0}/\mathcal{I}),$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal of holomorphic germs at x_0. Here $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{O}_{x_0}/\mathcal{I})$ means the dimension of $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}/\mathcal{I}$ viewed as a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$. This notion appears under different names in the literature. For example, on p.153 of [4], David Catlin calls it the multiplicity of the ideal $\mathcal{I}$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{I}(\lambda)$ be an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ that depends continuously on λ. Then $D\big(\mathcal{I}(\lambda), x_0\big)$ is an upper semi-continuous function of λ.*

This result is part of Proposition 5.3 on p.39 of [17] cited by D'Angelo in [10]. In our case, $\mathcal{I}(U, x_0)$ obviously depends continuously on U, so $D\big(\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), x_0\big)$ is upper semi-continuous on the compact set $\mathcal{U}(N)$. This implies $D\big(\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), x_0\big)$ achieves a maximum on $\mathcal{U}(N)$ because each $U \in \mathcal{U}(N)$ has an open neighborhood $V(U)$ such that

$$D\big(\mathcal{I}(U', x_0), x_0\big) \leq D\big(\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), x_0\big)$$

for every $U' \in V(U)$ from the upper semi-continuity, $\{V(U)\}$ is an open cover of $\mathcal{U}(N)$, we can thus pass to a finite open subcover $\{V(U_j)\}_{1 \leq j \leq p}$, and then we can take $\max\limits_{1 \leq j \leq p} D\big(\mathcal{I}(U_j, x_0), x_0\big)$.

Since we are primarily interested in the case $q > 1$, the object that appears naturally corresponding to a proper ideal $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ is $D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big)$, where $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ is a non-degenerate set of linear forms. It turns out that $D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big)$ is generic when we consider its value over all non-degenerate sets of linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$:

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a proper ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, and let $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. If $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ is any non-degenerate set of linear forms in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$,*

$$\inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) = gen.val_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big),$$

where $(\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1})$ is the ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ generated by $\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}$. In other words, the infimum is achieved and equals the generic value.

Proof: For every non-degenerate set of linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, we consider a linear change of variables at x_0 such that $w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}$ become the coordinate functions $z_1, \dots, z_{q-1}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ be the image of $\mathcal{I}$ under this linear change of variables. Consider now

$$D\Big((\tilde{\mathcal{I}}, z_1, \dots, z_{q-1}), x_0\Big) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Big(\mathcal{O}_{x_0}/(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}, z_1, \dots, z_{q-1})\Big).$$

Since the variables $z_1, \dots, z_{q-1}$ get set to zero in the quotient $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}/(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}, z_1, \dots, z_{q-1})$ and the quantity $D\Big((\tilde{\mathcal{I}}, z_1, \dots, z_{q-1}), x_0\Big)$ is invariant under linear changes of variables, it follows that

$$\inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) = \text{gen.}val_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big)$$

as needed. □

Propositions 2.7 and 2.8 together make looking at

$$\sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big)$$

much easier in the sense that the supremum and the infimum, which are both achieved, can be exchanged here. D'Angelo has already related this quantity to $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ in Theorem 14 on p.91 of [11]:

Theorem 2.9.

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) \leq 2 \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) \leq 2\Big(\Delta_q(M, x_0)\Big)^{n-q}$$

We shall use the lower bound,

$$\frac{1}{2}\, \Delta_q(M, x_0) \leq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) \tag{2.3}$$

in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Another ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is showing that $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ assumes the generic value with respect to choices of non-degenerate sets of linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ in its definition:

Proposition 2.10. *Let M be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let $x_0 \in M$. If $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ is any non-degenerate set of linear forms in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, the infimum in the definition of $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ is achieved and equal to the generic value,*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_q(M, x_0) &= \inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} \ \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big)\\ &= gen.val_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} \ \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where $(\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1})$ is the ideal in $C^\infty_{x_0}$ generated by $\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}$.

Proof: We consider two cases. First, if

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} \ \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) = \infty,$$

then clearly $\Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) = \infty$ for every non-degenerate set of linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, so

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \text{gen}.val_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} \ \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big),$$

i.e. the infimum is achieved and equal to the generic value. Second, assume $\Delta_q(M, x_0) = t < \infty$. One of the equivalent ways of defining $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ is as

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \inf_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} \ \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(n,x_0)} \ \inf_{g \in (\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1})} \ \frac{ord_0\, \varphi^* g}{ord_0\, \varphi}.$$

Obviously, the supremum is realized here by curves that set $w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}$ to zero as these functions have the lowest order of vanishing, namely 1. It follows that

$$\Delta_q(M, x_0) = \text{gen}.val_{\{w_1,\dots,w_{q-1}\}} \ \Delta_1\Big((\mathcal{I}(M), w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big),$$

and the infimum over all non-degenerate sets $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ of linear forms in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ is indeed achieved and equal to the generic value. □

Finally, we turn our attention to D'Angelo's property P, which he defined on p.631 of [10]:

Definition 2.11. *Let M be a real hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let x_0 be a point of finite type on M. We suppose that $\Delta_1(M, x_0) < k$. Let $j_{k,x_0} r = r_k = Re\{h\} + ||f||^2 - ||g||^2$ be a holomorphic decomposition at x_0 of the k-jet of the defining function r of M. We say that M satisfies property P at x_0 if for every holomorphic curve $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(n, x_0)$ for which $\varphi^* h$ vanishes, the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *$ord_0\, \varphi^* r$ is even, i.e. $ord_0\, \varphi^* r = 2a$, for some $a \in \mathbb{N}$;*
(ii) $\left(\dfrac{d}{dt}\right)^a \left(\dfrac{d}{d\bar{t}}\right)^a \varphi^* r(0) \neq 0.$

Remarks:
(1) Due to Theorem 2.4, the finite determination property of $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ for all $1 \leq q < n$, this definition is independent of k provided k is large enough.
(2) The condition $\varphi^* h \equiv 0$ is not in the least restrictive as M_k corresponding to the truncation r_k is a hypersurface, i.e. the function h has vanishing order 1 at x_0, so there is a change of variables at x_0 that maps the holomorphic polynomial h to the coordinate function z_n. Since the D'Angelo type does not depend on coordinate system and is always greater than or equal to 2, no holomorphic curve with $\varphi^* z_n(0) \neq 0$ can realize the supremum, so holomorphic curves in the original coordinate system that satisfy $\varphi^* h \not\equiv 0$ are irrelevant to the type computation.

Let us now define the q version of D'Angelo's property P, which is the hypothesis that appears in Theorem 1.1.

Definition 2.12. *Let M be a real hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let $x_0 \in M$ be such that $\Delta_q(M, x_0) < k$. Let $j_{k,x_0} r = r_k = Re\{h\} + ||f||^2 - ||g||^2$ be a holomorphic decomposition at x_0 of the k-jet of the defining function r of M. We say that M satisfies the q version of property P at x_0 if for every holomorphic curve $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(n, x_0)$ for which $\varphi^* h$ vanishes and such that the image of φ locally lies in the zero locus of a non-degenerate set of linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ at x_0, the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *$ord_0\, \varphi^* r$ is even, i.e. $ord_0\, \varphi^* r = 2a$, for some $a \in \mathbb{N}$;*
(ii) $\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^a \left(\frac{d}{d\bar{t}}\right)^a \varphi^* r(0) \neq 0.$

Remark: The change here versus D'Angelo's property P is that we ask that his conditions be satisfied only for the holomorphic curves that come into the computation of $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$.

The reason D'Angelo introduced property P is that it allowed him to prove the following result, which appears as Theorem 5.3 on p.631 of [10]:

Theorem 2.13. *Suppose that M satisfies property P at x_0, then*

$$\Delta_1(M, x_0) = 2\, \Delta_1(\mathcal{I}(U, x_0), x_0),$$

i.e. the upper bound in Equation (2.1) is achieved.

It turns out then that a pseudoconvex domain of finite D'Angelo type has property P as do the hypersurfaces corresponding to truncations of the defining function at x_0 of any order higher than the type. Before formally stating this result, we shall state a proposition that appeared as Proposition 2 on p.138 of [12], which justifies why such a result ought to be true.

Proposition 2.14. *Suppose that M is a pseudoconvex hypersurface containing the origin with local defining function r. Suppose further that $\varphi : (\mathbb{C}, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}^n, 0)$ is a parametrized holomorphic curve such that the Taylor series for $\varphi^* r$ satisfies*

(i) *$ord_0\, \varphi^* r = m$*

(ii) $\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^a \varphi^* r(0) = 0 \quad a \leq m.$

Then the order of vanishing $m = 2k$ *is even, and the coefficient of* $|t|^{2k}$ *in* $\varphi^* r$ *is positive.*

Remark: Condition (ii) is eliminating pure terms up to and including of order m, which is the vanishing order of $\varphi^* r$. The same is achieved via the requirement that $\varphi^* h \equiv 0$ in the definition of D'Angelo's property P as well as in the q version of property P.

The following result appears on p.632 of [10]:

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose* M *is pseudoconvex near* x_0*, and that* $\Delta_1(M, x_0)$ *is finite. Then* M *and* M_k*, the hypersurface corresponding to the truncation of order* k *of the defining function at* x_0*, satisfy property P at* x_0 *for all sufficiently large* k*.*

It is easy to see from Proposition 2.14 that the equivalent result should hold for the q version of property P as well:

Proposition 2.16. *Suppose* M *is pseudoconvex near* x_0*, and that* $\Delta_q(M, x_0)$ *is finite. Then* M *and* M_k*, the hypersurface corresponding to the truncation of order* k *of the defining function at* x_0*, satisfy the* q *version of property P at* x_0 *for all sufficiently large* k*.*

3. CATLIN q-TYPE

David Catlin wished to avoid having to characterize the order of contact of a holomorphic variety V^q of complex dimension q with the boundary of the domain along the singular locus of the variety, which can be considerably more complicated when $q > 1$ than for holomorphic curves. To that end, he introduced in [4] a numerical function $D_q(M, x_0)$ that measures the order of contact of varieties V^q with M only along generic directions.

Let V^q be the germ of a holomorphic variety of complex dimension q passing through x_0. Let W be the set of all $(n-q+1)$-dimensional complex planes through x_0. Consider the intersection $V^q \cap S$ for $S \in W$. For a generic, thus open and dense, subset $\tilde{W}$ of W, $V^q \cap S$ consists of finitely many one-dimensional components $V^q_{S,k}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, P$. Let us parametrize these curves by some open set $U \ni 0$ in $\mathbb{C}$. Thus, $\gamma^k_S : U \to V^q_{S,k}$, where $\gamma^k_S(0) = x_0$. Set

$$\tau(V^q \cap S, x_0) = \max_{k=1,\ldots,P} \frac{ord_0 \left(\gamma^k_S\right)^* r}{ord_0 \, \gamma^k_S}.$$

In Section 3 of [4], David Catlin showed $\tau(V^q \cap S, x_0)$ assumes the same value for all S in a generic subset $\tilde{W}$ of planes. Thus he defined

$$\tau(V^q, x_0) = gen.val \left\{ \tau(V^q \cap S, x_0) \right\}.$$

The same argument allowed him to define for every holomorphic germ $f \in \mathcal{O}_{x_0}$

$$\tau(f, V_S) = \max_{k=1,\ldots,P} \frac{ord_0 \left(\gamma^k_S\right)^* f}{ord_0 \, \gamma^k_S}$$

and

$$\tau(f, V^q) = gen.val \left\{ \tau(f, V_S) \right\}.$$

In a very similar fashion to D'Angelo in [10], Catlin then defined

$$\tau(\mathcal{I}, V^q) = \min_{f \in \mathcal{I}} \tau(f, V^q)$$

for an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of holomorphic germs in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$.

Definition 3.1. *Let M be a real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The Catlin q-type at $x_0 \in M$ is given by*

$$D_q(M, x_0) = \sup_{V^q} \left\{ \tau(V^q, x_0) \right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over the set of all germs of q-dimensional holomorphic varieties V^q passing through x_0.

Clearly, $\Delta_1(M, x_0) = D_1(M, x_0)$ as there is only one n-dimensional complex plane passing through x_0 in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

In keeping with the parallel to D'Angelo's work in [10], Catlin also defined his version of q-type for an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$:

Definition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ideal of holomorphic germs at x_0, then*

$$D_q(\mathcal{I}) = \sup_{V^q} \left\{ \tau(\mathcal{I}, V^q) \right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over the set of all germs of q-dimensional holomorphic varieties V^q passing through x_0.

The following is Catlin's Theorem 3.7 on p.154 of [4]:

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ and let $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ be any non-degenerate set of linear forms in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, then*

$$gen.val_{\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}} \; D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0 \Big) \leq \prod_{i=q}^{n} D_i(\mathcal{I}).$$

Remark: In the context of Catlin's definitions, the $(n-q+1)$-dimensional complex plane S through x_0 is precisely the zero locus of the non-degenerate set of linear forms $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$.

Since $D_k(\mathcal{I}) \leq D_q(\mathcal{I})$ for all $k \geq q$ and $D_n(\mathcal{I}) = 1$, we obtain the following corollary to Theorem 3.3, which appears at the top of p.156 of [4]:

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$ and let $\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ be any non-degenerate set of linear forms in $\mathcal{O}_{x_0}$, then*

$$gen.val_{\{w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}} \; D\Big((\mathcal{I}, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}), x_0 \Big) \leq \left(D_q(\mathcal{I}) \right)^{n-q}.$$

In case $\Delta_q(M, x_0) = t < \infty$, the truncation r_k of the defining function r of M at x_0 of order $k = \lceil t \rceil$ has the holomorphic decomposition $r_k = Re\{h\} + ||f||^2 - ||g||^2$, and M has the q version of D'Angelo's property P at x_0, we would like to relate $\tau(V^q, x_0)$ with $\tau(\mathcal{I}(U), V^q)$ for any unitary matrix $U \in \mathcal{U}(N)$ and any q-dimensional complex variety V^q. The reader may wish to check by going through the proof of D'Angelo's Theorem 5.3 on p.631 of [10], which we stated here as Theorem 2.13, that the q version of D'Angelo's property P at x_0 implies

$$\tau(V^q, x_0) \geq 2\,\tau(\mathcal{I}(U), V^q) \quad \forall\, U,\, \forall\, V^q.$$

David Catlin uses this exact reasoning on p.156 of [4] in order to finish the proof of his Theorem 3.4 without formally defining the q version of D'Angelo's property P. Instead, he employs this argument for a pseudoconvex domain, where we have shown that the q version of D'Angelo's property P holds if the D'Angelo q-type is finite. In his case, of course he assumes his q-type $D_q(M, x_0)$ is finite.

4. Proof of the Main Theorem

The proof of Theorem 1.1 will proceed in two steps. Each of the two directions of the comparison of $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ with $D_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ will be proven in a separate proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Let Ω in $\mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain with C^∞ boundary. Let $x_0 \in b\Omega$ be a point on the boundary of the domain. For any $1 \leq q < n$, $D_q(b\Omega, x_0) \leq \Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$.*

Proof: If $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) = \infty$, then the estimate is obviously true. We thus restrict ourselves to the case when $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) = t < \infty$. Assume the estimate is false, i.e. $D_q(b\Omega, x_0) > t$. Since $D_q(M, x_0)$ is defined as the supremum over all q-dimensional holomorphic varieties passing through x_0 of $\tau(V^q, x_0)$, there exists such a holomorphic variety V^q for which

$$\tau(V^q, x_0) = \text{gen.}val\,\{\tau(V^q \cap S, x_0)\} = t' > t,$$

but as we have shown in Proposition 2.10, $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$ is generic over the choice of S, so the curves in $V^q \cap S$ enter into the computation of $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0)$. Therefore,

$$\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) \geq t' > t,$$

which is obviously a contradiction. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let Ω in $\mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain with C^∞ boundary. Let $x_0 \in b\Omega$ be a point on the boundary of the domain. For any $1 \leq q < n$, if the domain has the q version of D'Angelo property P at x_0, then*

$$\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) \leq 2\left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q}.$$

Proof: Since the domain has the q version of D'Angelo property P at x_0, as shown at the end of Section 3, we obtain

$$\tau(V^q, x_0) \geq 2\,\tau(\mathcal{I}(U), V^q) \quad \forall\, U,\, \forall\, V^q.$$

Therefore,

$$D_q(b\Omega, x_0) = \sup_{V^q} \{\tau(V^q, x_0)\} \geq 2 \sup_{V^q} \{\tau(\mathcal{I}(U), V^q)\} = 2\, D_q(I(U)) \quad \forall\, U.$$

In other words,

$$\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2} \geq D_q(I(U)) \quad \forall\, U$$

and

$$\left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q} \geq \Big(D_q(I(U))\Big)^{n-q} \quad \forall\, U.$$

We can now take the supremum on the right over all unitary matrices $U \in \mathcal{U}(N)$ and use Corollary 3.4 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q} &\geq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \Big(D_q(I(U))\Big)^{n-q} \\ &\geq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} gen.val_{\{w_1,\ldots,w_{q-1}\}}\ D\Big((\mathcal{I}(U), w_1, \ldots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.8 and Equation (2.3),

$$\left(\frac{D_q(b\Omega, x_0)}{2}\right)^{n-q} \geq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(N)} \inf_{\{w_1,\ldots,w_{q-1}\}} D\Big((\mathcal{I}(U), w_1, \ldots, w_{q-1}), x_0\Big) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ \Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.1: We put together the results of Proposition 4.1 with Proposition 4.2 and the fact mentioned in Section 2 that a pseudoconvex domain satisfies the q version of D'Angelo's property P when $\Delta_q(b\Omega, x_0) < \infty$, namely Proposition 2.16. □

REFERENCES

[1] Harold P. Boas and Emil J. Straube. Global regularity of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem: a survey of the L^2-Sobolev theory. In *Several complex variables (Berkeley, CA, 1995–1996)*, volume 37 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 79–111. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[2] David Catlin. Necessary conditions for subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 117(1):147–171, 1983.

[3] David Catlin. Boundary invariants of pseudoconvex domains. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 120(3):529–586, 1984.

[4] David Catlin. Subelliptic estimates for the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 126(1):131–191, 1987.

[5] David W. Catlin. Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem. In *Complex analysis of several variables (Madison, Wis., 1982)*, volume 41 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 39–49. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.

[6] David W. Catlin and Jae-Seong Cho. Sharp estimates for the $\overline{\partial}$-neumann problem on regular coordinate domains. *Preprint.* arXiv:0811.0830v1, [math.CV] 5 Nov 2008.

[7] David W. Catlin and John P. D'Angelo. Subelliptic estimates. In *Complex analysis*, Trends Math., pages 75–94. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2010.

[8] John P. D'Angelo. Finite type conditions for real hypersurfaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 14(1):59–66 (1980), 1979.

[9] John P. D'Angelo. Subelliptic estimates and failure of semicontinuity for orders of contact. *Duke Math. J.*, 47(4):955–957, 1980.

[10] John P. D'Angelo. Real hypersurfaces, orders of contact, and applications. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 115(3):615–637, 1982.

[11] John P. D'Angelo. Finite-type conditions for real hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{C}^n$. In *Complex analysis (University Park, Pa., 1986)*, volume 1268 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 83–102. Springer, Berlin, 1987.

[12] John P. D'Angelo. *Several complex variables and the geometry of real hypersurfaces.* Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1993.

[13] John P. D'Angelo and Joseph J. Kohn. Subelliptic estimates and finite type. In *Several complex variables (Berkeley, CA, 1995–1996)*, volume 37 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 199–232. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[14] Tran Vu Khanh and Giuseppe Zampieri. Precise subelliptic estimates for a class of special domains. *Preprint.* arXiv:0812.2560v2, [math.CV] 7 Jan 2009.

[15] J. J. Kohn. Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem on pseudo-convex domains: sufficient conditions. *Acta Math.*, 142(1-2):79–122, 1979.

[16] Yum-Tong Siu. Effective termination of Kohn's algorithm for subelliptic multipliers. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 6(4, Special Issue: In honor of Joseph J. Kohn. Part 2):1169–1241, 2010.

[17] Jean-Claude Tougeron. *Idéaux de fonctions différentiables.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 71.

Simion Stoilow Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Research unit 3, 21 Calea Grivitei Street, 010702 Bucharest, Romania
E-mail address: `Vasile.Brinzanescu@imar.ro`

Department of Mathematics, University of Pennsylvania, 209 South 33^{rd} St., Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
E-mail address: `anicoara@math.upenn.edu`